

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**THE RESPONSE AND RECOVERY OF TEN HILL
COUNTRY PASTURE SPECIES SUBJECTED TO
WATER DEFICIT STRESS**

**A thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters in
Agricultural Science**

JAMES ROBERT ANDREW DAVIS

January 1995

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study were to: screen the response of several pasture species when subjected to water deficit stress, use these responses to test some predictions of plant strategy theory (Grime *et al.* 1988) in relation to stress, and examine some plant functional characteristics related to stress and interpret the responses in relation to plant community structure in hill country pastures. The rationale here is that by testing a range of species responses to controlled stress in artificial conditions significant patterns of ecological specialisation in plant traits may be detected.

Ten hill country pasture species were exposed to a controlled water deficit stress in a glasshouse experiment. The response of the plants to a progressively severe water stress followed by the resumption of water and nutrient supply for a three-week recovery period was assessed, using measurements of leaf extension, dry mass, senescence and tissue nutrient contents.

The ranking of species for resistance to water stress (defined as the ability of the plant to continue functioning during the stress) based on the measurements of leaf/petiole extension rate, was (lowest to highest): *Lolium perenne* < *Dactylis glomerata* < *Holcus lanatus* < *Agrostis capillaris* < *Plantago lanceolata* < *Agrostis castellana* < *Trifolium repens* < *Rytidosperma clavatum* < *Lotus corniculatus* < *Hieracium pilosella*. *Lolium perenne*, *Dactylis glomerata* and *Rytidosperma clavatum*, followed by *Trifolium repens* showed the highest resilience (defined as the rate of recovery after the stress is removed) again measured by leaf/petiole extension rate.

The difference in total dry mass between control and stress treatments was used to assess the effect of the stress on biomass accumulation. Those species classified with C attributes according to plant strategy theory survived the water stress through rapid plastic adjustments in leaf extension and senescence and developed a large difference in dry mass between the stress and control treatments. The stress tolerant type species had the least response in terms of difference in biomass accumulation and senescence.

The broad differences between plants with S-type and C-type attributes are consistent with plant strategy theory. However within the CR-CSR classification several different types of response to water deficit stress were evident. In particular, the CR-CSR strategists *Lolium perenne* and *Dactylis glomerata* showed a well developed capacity to cease leaf elongation early and senesce leaf material so as to preserve meristems in a viable state to allow recovery when water supply resumed. Other CR-CSR strategists did not have this capacity and several species died as a result of water stress.

This suggests that secondary functional types may be recognised within the primary types of CSR theory.

The results are discussed in relation to the coexistence of hill country pasture species. It is suggested that the persistence of *Lolium perenne* and *Dactylis glomerata* in hill country pastures may be partly related to a capacity for rapid plastic adjustments in leaf extension and leaf area so preserving dormant vegetative meristems during water stress, allowing rapid recovery in the cooler period of the year with adequate water.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank the following people for their assistance in various stages of this work. Their help is deeply appreciated

Peter Kemp

Bruce Campbell

Ian Valentine

Technicians at the Plant Growth Unit, Massey University.

Plant Science Department, Massey University.

Massey University Agricultural Research Foundation

Hugh and Angela Davis

Jill Lawler

Glen Houghton

Ian (Piggy) Millward

Shelly Wrigly

Anne-Marie O'Neill

John Lockhart

Ashby Howitt

Jeannie Rossiter

Janet McAllister

*'... omnes observationes nostrae propter instrumentorum sensuumque
imperfectionem non sint nisi approximationes ad veritatem ...'*

Gauss 1890

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Responses to water deficit stress in plants	1
1.1.1 Physiological and morphological responses	2
1.2 Physiological and morphological adaptations	8
1.2.1 Leaves	9
1.2.2 Stems	9
1.2.3 Roots	10
1.3 Plant strategy theory	10
1.3.1 Background	10
1.3.2 Stress and disturbance	11
1.3.3 Plant strategies	12
1.3.4 Plasticity	16
1.4 A comparative description of ten hill country species	18
2 MATERIALS AND METHODS	22
2.1 Principle	22
2.2 Pot design	22
2.3 Irrigation and Nutrient supply	25
2.4 Experimental design	26
2.4.1 Treatments	28
2.5 Moisture characteristics of pots	30
2.6 Measurements	31
2.6.1 Leaf/petiole extension	31
2.6.2 Fresh mass/dry mass	31
2.6.3 Plant tissue nutrient content	31
2.7 Data analysis	32
3 RESULTS	34
3.1 Leaf/petiole extension rate	34
3.2 Total dry mass	38
3.2.1 Relative difference between control and stress treatments	41

3.3 Above-ground dry mass.....	41
3.3.1 Relative difference between control and stress treatments.....	43
3.4 Root dry mass	44
3.4.1 Relative difference between control and stress treatments.....	46
3.5 Root:shoot ratio	48
3.6 Dead material content	50
3.7 Relative growth rate.....	52
3.8 Plant tissue nutrient content.....	52
3.9 Total plant tissue uptake plotted against functional attributes	55
4 DISCUSSION	71
4.1 Introduction	71
4.2 Experimental technique.....	71
4.3 Plant characteristics.....	72
4.4 Leaf extension during stress	73
4.5 Total dry mass at end of stress	76
4.6 Division of dry mass between shoot and root at end of stress.....	77
4.7 Dead material percentage at end of stress.....	79
4.8 Leaf extension rate during recovery	80
4.9 Total dry mass at end of recovery.....	81
4.10 Relative growth rate	81
4.11 Division of dry mass between shoot and root at end of recovery.....	82
4.12 Dead material percentage at end of recovery	82
4.13 Resistance and resilience.....	83
4.14 Plant tissue nutrient concentration	85
4.15 Response to water stress - morphological plasticity.....	86
4.15.1 Leaf extension index	86
4.15.2 Relative growth rate.....	87
4.15.3 Root:shoot ratio	87
4.15.4 Dead material content	88
4.16 Response to water stress and plant strategy theory predictions.....	89

4.17 Species coexistence in hill country pasture communities.....	91
5 CONCLUSION	95
REFERENCES	98
APPENDICES	105
Appendix I.....	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Values of leaf water potential required to halve stomatal conductance in a range of grasses.....	4
Table 2 Generalised sensitivity to water stress of plant processes.....	5
Table 3 Some characteristics of competitor (C), stress-tolerant (S) and ruderal (R) plants.....	13
Table 4 Comparative characteristics of the ten hill country species.....	19
Table 5 Predicted responses of the ten hill country species to water deficit stress, based on CSR theory.....	21
Table 6 Rorison nutrient solution.....	25
Table 7 Water and nutrient supply rates.....	26
Table 8 Plant species used in the experiment.....	27
Table 9 Experiment Treatments.....	28
Table 10 Mean total dry mass (g) of control and stress treatments for each species at the end of the recovery and the end of the stress period.....	38
Table 11 Mean above-ground dry mass (g) of control and stress treatments for each species at the end of the recovery and the end of the stress period.....	42
Table 12 Mean root dry mass (g) of control and stress treatments for each species at the end of the recovery and the end of the stress period.....	45
Table 13 Relative growth rate over recovery period ($\text{g g}^{-1} \text{ week}^{-1}$).....	52
Table 14 Plant tissue nitrogen concentration (mg g^{-1}) at end of stress period.....	53
Table 15 Plant tissue nitrogen concentration (mg g^{-1}) at end of recovery period.....	53
Table 16 Plant tissue phosphorus concentration (mg g^{-1}) at end of stress period.....	54
Table 17 Plant tissue phosphorus concentration (mg g^{-1}) at end of recovery period.....	55
Table 18 Species ranking of resistance and resilience.....	85
Table 19 Comparative characteristics of the ten hill country species.....	90

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Possible effects of mild water deficits.....	5
Figure 2 Triangular model describing the various equilibria between stress, disturbance and competition.....	15
Figure 3 Weight loss of water stress pots over time	30
Figure 4 a. <i>Lolium perenne</i> leaf extension rate.....	34
b. <i>Agrostis capillaris</i> leaf extension rate.....	34
c. <i>Agrostis castellana</i> leaf extension rate.....	34
d. <i>Dactylis glomerata</i> leaf extension rate	34
e. <i>Holcus lanatus</i> leaf extension rate.....	34
f. <i>Rytidosperma clavatum</i> leaf extension rate	34
g. <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> petiole extension rate	35
h. <i>Trifolium repens</i> petiole extension rate	35
i. <i>Plantago lanceolata</i> leaf extension rate.....	35
j. <i>Hieracium pilosella</i> leaf extension rate	35
Figure 5 Ratio difference in total dry mass between control and stress	41
Figure 6 Ratio difference in above-ground dry mass between control and stress	43
Figure 7 Ratio difference in root dry mass between control and stress.....	47
Figure 8 Root:shoot ratio at the end of stress period.....	48
Figure 9 Root:shoot ratio at the end of recovery period	48
Figure 10 Percent of dead material in above-ground at the end of stress period	50
Figure 11 Percent of dead material in above-ground at the end of recovery period.....	50
Figure 12 Change in phosphorus over the recovery period plotted against leaf extension index.....	55
Figure 13 Change in nitrogen over the recovery period plotted against leaf extension index.....	56
Figure 14 Change in phosphorus over the recovery period plotted against the relative growth rate over the same period.....	57

Figure 15 Change in nitrogen over the recovery period plotted against the relative growth rate over the same period.....	57
Figure 16 Change in phosphorus over the recovery period plotted against the difference in control and stress treatments root:shoot ratio at the end of the stress period.....	58
Figure 17 Change in nitrogen over the recovery period plotted against the difference in control and stress treatment root:shoot ratio at the end of the stress period.....	59
Figure 18 Change in phosphorus over the recovery period plotted against percent dead material at the end of the stress period.....	59
Figure 19 Change in nitrogen over the recovery period plotted against the dead material percentage at the end of the stress period	59
Figure 20 Change in phosphorus over the recovery period plotted against the dead material percentage at the end of the recovery period.....	59
Figure 22 Leaf/petiole elongation rate pattern.....	84
Figure 23 The structure of a general theory of species coexistence.....	93

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1 Germination of seed directly into stone chip with agar.....	23
Plate 2 Cylinder elevated during stress to facilitate drainage of moisture from cylinder.....	23
Plate 3 a-j Control and stress treatments at the end of the stress period	61
Plate 4 a-j Control and stress treatments at the end of the recovery period	66